



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,313	11/16/2005	Christopher G. Schaeffer	2224-125US//P28,090-A-USA	9124
20#02                      7590                      07/30/2009				
FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP				
P O BOX 592				
112 NASSAU STREET				
PRINCETON, NJ 08542-0592				
EXAMINER				
LUDLOW, JAN M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/30/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/519,313

**Applicant(s)**

SCHAEFFER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jan M. Ludlow

**Art Unit**

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 December 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

1. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, it is not clear what the source of "a mixture" is—as written, the mixture could be formed by the diffusion of oxidant from the sample gas into the fuel. In claim 6, "6)" should be "6." for consistency and it is unclear how the oxidant can be present without an ignition zone in that in instant Figure 7c indicates that an ignition zone is always present in the presence of oxygen. See also claims 12 and 18. In claim 7, line 4, "providing" is a method step, not a structural limitation. In claim 7, there is no structural connection between the calculating means and the remainder of the apparatus—this could read on a calculator in the operator's pocket. See also claim 13. The examiner suggests an operative connection for receiving a signal from the measuring means or temperature sensor. In claim 9, "said gas" should be "said neutral gas" for proper antecedence. See also claim 15. Claim 11 is unclear because "providing" and "using" are method steps, not structural limitations. In claim 11, penultimate line, "aid second" should be "said second". Claim 17 is unclear as a whole because it is unclear what structural limitations to the apparatus are intended—a source of a second mixture coupled to the burner, a controller operative to create a second flame, measure a second temperature and determine a concentration?

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
5. Claims 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chapman et al. in view of Huang (6485689).

Chapman teaches an apparatus for flame analysis in which oxygen, air and fuel are combined in the burner stem. It is the examiner's position that the flame is generated at the opposite end of the stem. Solutions of metals are introduced into the cell for measurement by aspiration. It is the examiner's position that these solutions are therefore evaporated to gases. Flame temperature measurement means are provided.

See, e.g., page 564. In that Chapman teaches a mixture of fuel, air and oxygen as disclosed, it is the examiner's position that the ignition zone is present.

Chapman fails to teach calculation means.

Huang teaches a device similar to that of Chapman. A PC 30 is used to control the apparatus and to perform data processing (Fig. 15 and accompanying text).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a general purpose personal computer to control the apparatus of Chapman and to collect and manipulate data as taught by Huang. It is the examiner's position that a PC is structurally capable of performing the desired calculations, were the appropriate instructions input. The examiner recommends a more concrete limitation limiting the calculating means to be operative to determine a concentration of combustible gases in said sample using the temperature, such a limitation inherently including software or other means for performing the actual calculations. With respect to claims 10, 16, Chapman teaches up to 32% oxygen (p. 567); it would have been obvious to optimize the oxygen concentration to obtain desired results with minimal added reagent (oxygen) usage.

6. Claims 1-6 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest method or apparatus for determining the concentration of combustible gases in a sample by burning the sample with an oxidant in a concentration selected to form a diffusion flame having an inner

ignition zone and a main reaction zone, measuring the temperature of the diffusion flame, and calculating concentrations based on the temperature.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jan M. Ludlow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1260. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday and Thursday, 11:30 am - 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jan M. Ludlow  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1797

/Jan M. Ludlow/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Application/Control Number: 10/519,313  
Art Unit: 1797

Page 6